

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 15 DEC 1983
TO: Director, ODP		
ROOM NO. 2D0105	BUILDING Hdqs	
REMARKS:		
FROM:		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

ER 83-6018

15 December 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Information Systems Board Members

FROM: [REDACTED]

Executive Secretary to the Board

SUBJECT: Minutes of 17 November 1983 Meeting of the
Information Systems Board

1. The Information Systems Board met on Thursday, 17 November 1983. Charles Briggs (ExDir) presided and participants included Board members: Danny Childs (Compt), [REDACTED] William Donnelly (D/ORD), Rutledge Hazzard (D/NPIC), [REDACTED] Philip Eckman (DD/OD&E for Robert Kohler), [REDACTED] Clarus Rice (D/OCR), [REDACTED] (C/IMS) and [REDACTED] (C/ASG). The following individuals representing Workstation Environment Working Group attended: [REDACTED] (C/S&TB/ASG). Chairman: [REDACTED] (C/TR/ED/ODP). [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] also attended. [REDACTED]

2. Mr. Briggs opened the meeting announcing that the minutes of the last Board meeting of 17 October 1983 were not yet completed and would be sent to the members shortly. (Those minutes were distributed on 30 November 1983.) He then turned the meeting over to [REDACTED] Chairman of the Workstation Environment Working Group, who briefed the Board on the Working Group's "Interim Report -- Combining Word and Data Processing in a Single Terminal." [REDACTED]

3. [REDACTED] introduced the four other members of the Working Group in attendance and explained that the Working Group needed the Board's reactions in order to make the final report more responsive. He further commented that the Working Group felt pressured to give the Board some analysis of the issue and the range of options quickly and thus focused their effort on the near term -- 1983 to 1988. Because of the press of time, the group was forced to omit user surveys, requirements studies, cost-benefit analysis, and coordination. Virtually all components of the Agency interested in workstations were represented on the group, however, so the group felt its "collective consciousness" adequate, possibly obviating the need for coordination and surveys. [REDACTED] also explained that [REDACTED]

25X1 the report had been written by six individuals and thanked [redacted]
 25X1 [redacted] in particular, for melding the work of the separate authors
 25X1 into one coherent, readable document. [redacted]

25X1 4. Rather than summarizing the report and reiterating its
 25X1 recommendations -- since the Board members had read the document --
 25X1 [redacted] instead called the attention of the Board to a few
 points:

25X1 a. The long-term options and recommendations should be
 considered as tentative and could well change in the final
 report, but the short term options and recommendations should
 be considered final. The Working Group felt that additional
 effort would produce no new options, nor another
 recommendation. [redacted]

25X1 b. The third purpose of the report -- to provide an input
 to the ODP's RFP (Request for Proposal) for a follow-on
 terminal to the current Delta Data contract -- is at least as
 important as the first two -- the need to inform the Board of
 the group's initial findings and to communicate ideas to the
 other working groups (page 2, paragraph 2). [redacted]

25X1 c. [redacted] noted that the 300 "other types" of
 terminals in Figure 1 (page 7) included about 220 personal
 computers. He suggested that the "functional gaps" in the
 Agency's VDTs (page 8, paragraph 5) -- neither the Delta Data
 nor the Wang creates a true desk-top environment -- may be one
 explanation for the popularity of personal computers. Speaking
 of other gaps, [redacted] noted the Working Group's strong
 conviction that training is inadequate, particularly on-line
 automated assistance -- largely because there is no single
 focal point with responsibility for training. [redacted]

25X1 d. In discussing the problems of a cost-benefit analysis
 (page 10), [redacted] suggested that cost is relative and that
 it is virtually impossible to quantify the benefits of one
 automation plan over another, or even of automating in general,
 because automation changes the way people do their work. He
 suggested that a comparison of equipment costs to the salaries
 of the people who use the equipment might help. He observed
 that we routinely pay 7-10 percent of a secretary's salary for
 a typewriter, and that the same proportion of a professional
 employee's salary would indicate a \$2,500 to \$4,000 terminal.
 [redacted]

25X1 e. Referring to the long-term options portion of the
 report, [redacted] mentioned the Working Group's opinion that
 the terminal should ultimately be the device connecting
 communications, memory, processing, and Artificial Intelligence
 (AI) for the user. As such, certain capabilities of that
 terminal are essential: bit mapped display to improve the
 quality of graphics and images, multiple windows to permit

several functions simultaneously, and end-user programming to help reduce the applications backlog in ODP. []

f. AI programs, with the potential for greatly increasing analytical productivity, are not designed to run on the IBM mainframes which are the basis of the Agency's ADP system. Such programs require special "LISP" machines, some of which qualify as personal computers. []

5. When [] concluded, Mr. Briggs praised the Working Group for preparing a relatively complete and thoroughly readable analysis by the deadline set. He pointed out that the report paralleled many of the ideas expressed at the Wang Executive Seminar he had attended the previous week. The remarks of Dr. James McKenny of Harvard -- that a new era in computing is emerging in which the user is becoming increasingly involved, even to the point of designing his own workstation, and that the role of the information manager should be to support such change -- were particularly apropos. Mr. Briggs explained that ADP technicians should not dread the increased involvement of the users, recalling that operations officers once feared they would be made obsolete by new collection technologies when, in fact, the value of HUMINT has never been more certain. []

6. Mr. Briggs then asked the Working Group why overseas terminals had been omitted from the report. [] answered

[] Mr. Briggs also asked the status of tempest requirements for the new and old buildings. Mr. Donnelly stated that the new building would be shielded and thus tempesting would be redundant. He also stated that a number of exceptions had been made to the tempest requirement for the present headquarters building, but that such exceptions could not be made for buildings outside the Headquarters compound. Mr. Briggs questioned the status of the Local Area Network (LAN) and Mr. Donnelly replied that a LAN would be installed in the new building and that OC has money to study putting a LAN in the old building as well. []

7. Mr. Briggs asked [] to brief the Board on the minority opinion contained in her memorandum to the Board of 16 November 1983. [] took issue with two points in the Working Group report, and suggested that:

a. Within the third option (page 15), augmenting Host-Based Word Processing, the implication that the number of Wang terminals be reduced is contrary to the needs of several Agency components and should be deleted.

b. The short-term recommendation (page 17) to meet new terminal requirements with personal computers should not be endorsed by the Board before more detailed technical studies of requirements, security, system integration, and the impact on large Agency ADP projects can be made.

8. Several Board members complimented the Working Group's report for its organization, quality, and lack of jargon. Mr. Rice pointed out that the group did exactly what it was asked to do -- an assessment of the desirability of and options for merging word and data processing in a single terminal -- and lauded the group for producing the report within the allotted, albeit short, time frame of three months. Mr. Childs asked if the recommendation to use personal computers would require a fundamental change in the Agency's computer architecture. In answer, Mr. Briggs read the following section from the report:

... the ultimate solution involves a fundamental change in the Agency's computer architecture, away from a centralized computing and file-server system, toward a decentralized computing base retaining the centralized file maintenance function. It may be only small consolation, but this solution is not unique to CIA; it is a world-wide trend in how large computer complexes work (page 14, paragraph 2).

25X1 [] agreed that full implementation of the Working Group's
25X1 recommendation would create restructuring of the present ADP
architecture. []

9. Mr. Briggs stated that the Board should be aware that a decision to adopt the Working Group's recommendation to use personal computers as a way to combine word and data processing would have a
25X1 significant impact on Agency computing in general. []
25X1 suggested that the Board should not decide such a "fundamental and
important" issue solely on the basis of "one interim report from one
working group." He agreed with [] recommendation that
further detailed, technical analysis should be done. Mr. Briggs
again thanked the Working Group for its efforts and asked the
25X1 members to leave the meeting so that the Board could discuss the
report in camera. []

25X1 10. During the ensuing discussion, [] asked how
many workstations the Board was talking about, since he had never
seen an official Agency commitment to put a terminal on every
desk. Mr. Childs felt that many employees have no need for a
terminal and a study should be made of the categories of CIA
functions that do require computing capabilities, but Mr. Briggs
25X1 suggested that one terminal for every desk probably is the "ultimate
goal." [] suggested that the operant word is "desk" --
couriers, drivers, and similar occupations have no need for a
terminal, but any employee currently using a desk, telephone, and
typewriter (or paper and pencil) eventually will need a terminal.
Mr. Briggs commended Appendix A of the interim report to the Board,
25X1 remarking that it contained much vital information about the effect
of terminals on the people who use them, which should be taken into
25X1 account in any technical study. []

11. [] suggested that, even if the Board approved
the recommendation, a prototype study and phased introduction of any

25X1 new equipment is the best way to proceed. [] agreed that
prototyping is imperative if the users' long-term requirements, not
ephemeral "wishes," were to be satisfied. He further criticized the
interim report for not including requirements and costing
25X1 information. Mr. Rice reiterated that the group had not been given
enough time to do a formal costing and requirements analysis. []

12. Mr. Briggs then suggested that Board members probably had
not had sufficient time to discuss the merits of the Working Group's
recommendations with their staffs and advisors and that the Board
would devote the next meeting to a discussion of the issues just
raised. He asked that Board members, after consulting with their
staffs, express their opinions and judgments about the Working
Group's recommendation in memoranda to him. He further asked the
Executive Secretary of the Board to collate those memoranda and
prepare an agenda for the next meeting that addresses all the issues
of concern to Board members. The next meeting is scheduled for
Friday, 16 December 1983 at 1330 hours in the DCI Conference Room.

25X1 []
25X1



Page Denied

Next 13 Page(s) In Document Denied